

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1 and 3-10 are currently pending in this application. Claim 2 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. For instance, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of previously presented claim 2, now cancelled. Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all outstanding rejections and allow the currently pending claims.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to claim 8 and asserts that the limitation "an opening" should be "positively recited for completeness." Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 8 has been amended to positively recite the presence of an opening. As such, this objection is moot.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Issues Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kakiuchi et al. (U.S. 6,750,165) (hereinafter US '165). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner asserts that US '165 discloses a wet cleaning sheet comprising a liquid retaining/retentive sheet (4) made of a fibrous material and impregnated with a predetermined

amount of detergent. The Examiner further asserts that US '165 teaches that the liquid retentive sheet has a liquid impermeable sheet (7) on one side thereof, and a liquid gradual-releasing sheet (6) on the other.

The Examiner acknowledges that US '165 does not explicitly disclose that the liquid gradual-releasing sheet (6) has an air permeability of 0.05 to 6 m/kPa.s so as to control the gradual release of the detergent. However, the Examiner asserts that US '165 "is already concerned with ensuring a gradual release of detergent from the liquid gradual-releasing sheet 6...and therefore where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed, it has been held that discovering the optimum or workable ranges only involves routine skill in the art."

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Additionally, there must be a reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would modify the reference or combine reference teachings to obtain the invention. A patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art. *KSR Int'l Co. v Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007). There must be a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new invention does. *Id.* The Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the "teaching, suggestion, motivation test" is a valid test for obviousness, albeit one which cannot be too rigidly applied. *Id.* Rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere

conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *Id.*

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of previously presented claim 2, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable. As such, Applicants submit that claim 1 and all dependent claims thereof are allowable.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicates that claims 2-5 and 8-10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of previously presented claim 2, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable. Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form. As such, Applicants submit that all presently pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

A Notice of Allowability is thus respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and objections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Vanessa Perez-Ramos, Reg. No. 61,158, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated:

MAY 01 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John W. Bailey

Registration No.: 32,881

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant